



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,321	03/26/2004	Jacob Tepper	PETRA 3.0-034	8015
28885	7590	09/23/2005		
WEINGRAM & ASSOCIATES P.C. P.O. BOX 927 MAYWOOD, NJ 07607			EXAMINER GRILES, BETHANY L	
			ART UNIT 3643	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,321

Applicant(s)

TEPPER ET AL.

Examiner

Bethany L. Griles

Art Unit

3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C.

121:

- I. Claims 1-16, drawn to a pet chew, classified in class 119, subclass 710.
- II. Claims 17-20, drawn to the process of making a pet chew, classified in class 119, subclass 710.

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made.

The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the pet chew could be made by hand.

During a telephone conversation with Edward Weingram on 8/17/05 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of a method of making a pet chew, claims 17-20. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-16 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hague et al. US6827041.

Regarding claim 17, Hague et al. disclose a method of making a pet chew comprising the steps of:

Providing an animal hide split which has been cleaned and bleached (col 2, lines 1-7), providing a coloring solution comprising a colorant (in this case, a bleaching solution (col 3, line 7), which changes the color of the pigskin, maintaining the animal hide split in the coloring solution for a sufficient time to allow the coloring solution to penetrate the animal hide, fixing the color to prevent staining comprising adding a sufficient amount of an edible acid (Hague et al. col. 4, line 36-39) disclose the use of ammonium chloride to reduce the pH); cutting the split into strips having a desired configuration (col 5, line 18); and forming at least one strip into a pet chew having a desired configuration (col 5, line 19).

Regarding claim 19, Hague et al. disclose flavoring the chew by means of basting (col 4, lines 54-57).

Regarding claim 20, Hague et al. exposing the pet chew to a temperature to dry it and sterilize it (col 5, lines 26-30).

Art Unit: 3643

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hague et al. (US6827041).

Regarding claim 18, Hague et al. disclose a pH of about 6.

Hague et al. do not disclose a pH in the range of 5-5.8.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the pH in the range of 5-5.8, as this value is very close to the value of 6 which is disclosed by Hague et al. and could be arrived at through routine trial and experimentation.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kirch 6840196; Hingst US6895900.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bethany L. Griles whose telephone number is 571.272.6888. The examiner can normally be reached on Wednesday and Thursday, 5.30 am-2.00 pm.


Art Unit: 3643

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M. Poon can be reached on 571.272.6891. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Bethany L. Griles
Examiner
Art Unit 3643

blg


Peter M. Poon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3600

9/1/05